



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/813,250

03/30/2004

Michael A. Schultz

108524

4825

23490

7590

07/17/2008

HONEYWELL INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY INC

PATENT SERVICES

101 COLUMBIA DRIVE

P O BOX 2245 MAIL STOP AB/2B

MORRISTOWN, NJ 07962

EXAMINER

BOYER, RANDY

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1797

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/17/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 10/813,250	Applicant(s) SCHULTZ ET AL.	
	Examiner RANDY BOYER	Art Unit 1797	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 08 July 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
- The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
- Claim(s) allowed: 3-8, 11 and 28-31.
- Claim(s) objected to: none.
- Claim(s) rejected: 23, 24, 27 and 32-44.
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Glenn A Caldarola/
 Acting SPE of Art Unit 1797

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's amendment to the claims and remarks are insufficient and nonpersuasive to overcome the previous rejections as set forth in the Office Action mailed 28 May 2008. Consequently, the claims are rejected as follows:

(a) Claims 23, 24, 32-39, 41, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsybulevskiy (US 2002/0009404) in view of Bal (US 6,482,316), Wessels (US 4,354,929), and Ramirez (US 6,019,887);

(b) Claims 40, 43, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsybulevskiy (US 2002/0009404) in view of Bal (US 6,482,316), Wessels (US 4,354,929), Ramirez (US 6,019,887), and further in view of Rice (US 6,395,950); and

(c) Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsybulevskiy (US 2002/0009404) in view of Bal (US 6,482,316), Wessels (US 4,354,929), and Rice (US 6,395,950).

Applicant argues that (1) Rice does not disclose obtaining a separate purge stream from the fractionation zone; and (2) Wessels discloses using the same material for purging and desorbing and does not recycle two separate purge and desorbent streams.

In response to Applicant's arguments, such arguments are not persuasive because one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In this regard, Examiner notes that Wessels (not Rice) discloses obtaining a purge stream from a fractionation zone (see Wessels, column 1, lines 21-41) and recycle/reuse of the purge stream (see Wessels, column 1, lines 38-41). In addition, Rice (not Wessels) discloses separation of the desorbent in a fractionation zone and recycle/reuse of the desorbent (see Rice, column 14, lines 6-40).

RPB

/Glenn A Caldarola/
Acting SPE of Art Unit 1797